

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs.

Criminal Action 2:24-cr-144
JUDGE JAMES L. GRAHAM

AMY SMART

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The United States and defendant Amy Smart entered into a *Plea Agreement*, ECF No. 3, executed pursuant to the provisions of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(C), whereby defendant agreed to plead guilty to an *Information*, ECF No. 2, charging her with making a false statement in connection with a health care matter in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1035(a)(1).¹ On October 16, 2024, defendant personally appeared with her counsel for an initial appearance, arraignment and entry of guilty plea proceeding.

Defendant waived her right to an indictment in open court and after being advised of the nature of the charge and of her rights. See Fed. R. Crim P. 7(b).

Defendant consented, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(3), to enter a guilty plea before a Magistrate Judge. See *United States v. Cukaj*, 25 Fed. Appx. 290, 291(6th Cir. 2001) (Magistrate Judge may accept a guilty plea with the express consent of the defendant and where no objection to the report and recommendation is filed).

During the plea proceeding, the undersigned observed the appearance and responsiveness of defendant in answering questions.

¹ The *Plea Agreement* makes no mention of an agreed fine; the parties agreed at the plea hearing that the parties do not contemplate the imposition of a fine. In addition to specifying other sentencing terms, the *Plea Agreement* includes an appellate waiver provision that preserves only certain claims for appeal, collateral challenge, or motion for reduction of sentence. Under the *Plea Agreement*, defendant also agreed to a restitution obligation and also agreed to her permanent exclusion from any federal and Ohio health care benefit program.

Based on that observation, the undersigned is satisfied that, at the time she entered her guilty plea, defendant was in full possession of her faculties, was not suffering from any apparent physical or mental illness, and was not under the influence of narcotics, other drugs, or alcohol.

Prior to accepting defendant's plea, the undersigned addressed defendant personally and in open court and determined her competence to plead. Based on the observations of the undersigned, defendant understands the nature and meaning of the charge in the *Information* and the consequences of her plea of guilty to that charge. Defendant was also addressed personally and in open court and advised of each of the rights referred to in Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

Having engaged in the colloquy required by Rule 11, the Court concludes that defendant's plea is voluntary. Defendant acknowledged that the *Plea Agreement* signed by her, her attorney, and the attorney for the United States and filed on September 23, 2024, represents the only promises made by anyone regarding the charge in the *Information*. Defendant was advised that the District Judge may accept or reject the *Plea Agreement*. Defendant was further advised that, if the District Judge refuses to accept the *Plea Agreement*, defendant will have the opportunity to withdraw her guilty plea but that, if she does not withdraw her guilty plea under those circumstances, the District Judge may impose a sentence that is more severe than the sentence contemplated in the *Plea Agreement*, up to the statutory maximum.

Defendant confirmed the accuracy of the statement of facts supporting the charge, which is attached to the *Plea Agreement*. She confirmed that she is pleading guilty to Count 1 of the *Information* because she is in fact guilty of the crime charged in that count. The Court concludes that there is a factual basis for the plea.

The Court concludes that defendant's plea of guilty to Count 1 of the *Information* is knowingly and voluntarily made with understanding

of the nature and meaning of the charge and of the consequences of the plea.

It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that defendant's guilty plea to Count 1 of the *Information* be accepted. Decision on acceptance or rejection of the *Plea Agreement* was deferred for consideration by the District Judge after the preparation of a presentence investigation report.

In accordance with S.D. Ohio Crim. R. 32.1, and as expressly agreed to by defendant through counsel, a written presentence investigation report will be prepared by the United States Probation Office. Defendant will be asked to provide information; defendant's attorney may be present if defendant so wishes. Objections to the presentence report must be made in accordance with the rules of this Court.

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this *Report and Recommendation*, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the *Report and Recommendation*, specifically designating this *Report and Recommendation*, and the part thereof in question, as well as the basis for objection thereto. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1); F.R. Civ. P. 72(b). Response to objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy thereof. F.R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the *Report and Recommendation* will result in the forfeiture of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and of the right to appeal the decision of the District Court adopting the *Report and Recommendation*. See *United States v. Wandahsega*, 924 F.3d 868, 878 (6th Cir. 2019); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985).

October 16, 024
Date

s/ Norah McCann King
Norah McCann King
United States Magistrate Judge